

In introducing the bill I provided for a 1-year duration, because I do not think any danger will accrue by allowing 1 year. It is really a period in which to redeem. This is what is called a one-for-one program.

In other words, when the original bill was passed, we said to the people interested in the building industry, "If you will buy mortgages now from Fannie May"—the Federal National Mortgage Association had the mortgages for sale—"then Fannie May will give you a commitment at a future time to buy back an identical amount from you."

It was an administrative matter as to how long the period for redemption would run, and the Administrator simply terminated the redemptions at the end of 1 year.

I think the period should be long enough to permit all who make purchases within 1 year to have an opportunity to redeem them. That is the reason why I introduced the bill providing for 1 year. I think it is a good measure.

I wrote a letter to the Administrator, the Honorable Albert Cole, calling his attention to the fact that he could correct the situation administratively, and that I hoped he would do so; but, if not, I certainly hoped the Senate would enact legislation, because I think not only would it be good, so far as the housing program is concerned, but would also be doing only what Congress promised to do, namely, to redeem its pledge.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

#### INCREASED EFFICIENCY OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

This proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record a letter and a statement of purpose and need in support of the bill furnished to me by the Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1647) to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
Washington.

The Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department recommends to the Congress for its consideration the attached draft of a proposed bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes.

There is also attached a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to submission to the Congress of this proposed draft legislation.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,  
Secretary of Commerce.

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO INCREASE THE EFFICIENCY OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The proposed legislation has two distinct purposes: First, to amend existing law to reflect current needs and practices, and second, to repeal several laws which are no longer valid or useful. The various proposals are set forth in detail in the following analysis by section:

##### ANALYSIS BY SECTION

Section 1 corrects a provision in present legislation (33 U. S. C. 862) by which commissioned officers and field employees are prohibited from making allotments from their pay while stationed in the District of Columbia. This prohibition causes inconvenience and occasions unnecessary clerical work in the case of officers and field personnel temporarily assigned to Washington, particularly as regards allotments for payment of National Service Life Insurance premiums.

Section 2 (a). The titles "Aid," "Junior Hydrographic and Geodetic Engineer," and "Hydrographic and Geodetic Engineer" are no longer used. Under section 2 of the act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 297; 33 U. S. C. 853a) officers are commissioned in the Coast and Geodetic Survey in grades from ensign to captain and in relative rank with officers of the Navy. The requirement for proof of mental and physical fitness for appointment or promotion is retained. The proposed amendment contains no substantive change and conforms with present promotion policies.

Section 2(b) clears up an ambiguity occasioned by earlier legislation to the effect that officers transferred to the War or Navy Departments shall rank "with and after" officers of their equivalent grades in those services. The Judge Advocate General of the Army has found it necessary to construe this wording literally. As a result, an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey serving in the Armed Forces always remains at the bottom of his grade regardless of the date of his commission, and officers of the Army and Navy promoted to his grade subsequent to him immediately supersede him in precedence. The amendment will permit recognition of the qualifications and experience of an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey serving with the military forces, where assignments are predicated on seniority in grade and lineal list number. The War Department has suggested that remedial legislation be obtained. The titles of "hydrographic and geodetic engineer," "junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer," and "aid," used in the act of May 22, 1917, have been displaced by titles of rank relative with officers of the Navy in subsequent legislation. The pay stipulated in the act of May 22, 1917, has been changed by legislation affecting all commissioned services.

Section 3(a) authorizes the crediting to commissioned officers of service as deck officer and junior engineer for purposes of promotion. Present law authorizes the crediting of all such service for purposes of pay, allowances, retirement, and retirement pay, but only service in excess of 1 year as deck officer and junior engineer is creditable for promotion purposes. The practice of requiring a probationary period of 6 months as deck officer has been abandoned and newly-appointed officers are commis-

sioned as ensigns immediately. Deck officer or junior engineer service is the equivalent of service as ensign in all respects. Officers in both grades receive the same assignments and perform the same type of duty.

Section 3(b): Under present law the assistant director is appointed without specification as to term of office. The proposed amendment would authorize a 4-year term of office and permit reappointment for further periods of 4 years each. This is in line with the law governing the appointment of the director of the bureau. Provision is also made for automatic termination of the assistant director's appointment at an earlier date in the event that a new director is appointed.

The second proviso of the section is further amended by deleting the clause "and the authorized number of ensigns shall be decreased accordingly." The maximum number of commissioned officers on the active list is fixed in the annual appropriation act. As presently written this section could be interpreted to force the discharge of an ensign when and if the director or assistant director reverted to a permanent grade, although this is not the intent of the law. Since the maximum number of active duty officers is fixed in other law, there appears to be no need for this restriction.

Section 4 (a) adds to the law a provision for promotion of ensigns after 2 years of service when vacancies exist in the next higher grade. This service has no provision for temporary promotions, as other commissioned services have, except in time of war when temporary promotions may be made to fill vacancies caused by transfer of officers to the military services. The competition for well-qualified graduate engineers is very keen. The necessity for some additional incentive to induce our ensigns to remain in the service is apparent. The law prohibits the promotion of ensigns until 3 years of creditable service have been completed. This prohibition is a severe deterrent to recruitment of junior officers.

Section 4 (b). The law contains no specific provision for original appointments as ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The proposed amendment inserts the words "appointment in and" before the word "promotions" at the beginning of the section. As amended, the law will conform with present practices.

Section 5 (1): This statute was enacted on June 17, 1844. At that time officers of the Navy were assigned to duty on hydrographic surveys and officers of the Army were employed on topographic surveys. Such assignments were made at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury. No Army officers have been assigned to such duty since 1861 and no Navy officer has been so assigned since 1898. While repeal of this act would cancel the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to request assignment of Army and Navy officers to survey duty, the act of July 10, 1832 (4 Stat. 571; 33 U. S. C. 884) gives the President the power to employ "all persons in the land and naval service of the United States" in the execution of the statutes relating to the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Section 5 (2). This act is a corollary to section 4687 R. S. and provides for payment of subsistence to officers of the Army or Navy when assigned to duty with the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Other law (the Career Compensation Act of 1949) provides an adequate legal basis for payment of such allowances.

Section 5 (3). The annual report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey has not been printed in quarto form since 1912. The report to Congress submitted annually by the Secretary of Commerce contains a full statement of all expenditures made under the direction of the Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey (33 U. S. C. 888) and a brief

summary of the work done by the bureau during the year covered by the report. Reference is made to the Comptroller General's decision No. B109771 dated October 17, 1952.

Section 5 (4): With the granting of independence to the Philippine Islands all responsibility for surveys in the islands was assumed by the new republic. Coast and Geodetic Survey officers are no longer assigned to duty in the Philippines; therefore, the law is no longer of use.

Section 5 (5): Section 5 of the Act of August 6, 1947 (61 Stat. 788; 33 U. S. C. 883e) contains sufficient authority for the Director to enter into cooperative agreements of this nature with any State. The surveys required under the Act of March 9, 1909, have been completed.

#### ESTIMATE OF COSTS

Section 4 (a): Pay and allowances for commissioned officers would be increased \$549.12 for each ensign promoted to lieutenant (j. g.) at the end of 2 years.

All other sections of the bill are for the purpose of improving administrative procedures only, and no additional costs are involved. Some small savings will be realized through elimination of complications in accounting work on allotments of pay.

#### AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT, RELATING TO PROTESTS OF GRANTS OF INSTRUMENTS OF AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Federal Communications Commission I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Commission explaining the purpose of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1648) to amend section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1955.  
The VICE PRESIDENT,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission wishes to recommend for the consideration of the Congress a proposed amendment to section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. A proposed bill is attached as an appendix to this letter. The objective of the proposed legislation is to clarify the so-called protest rule contained in section 309 (c) which was incorporated into the Communications Act by the Communications Act Amendments, 1952, 66 Stat. 711, so as to obviate the use of the new procedure as a device for delaying radio station grants which are in the public interest while at the same time retaining the rule's primary objective of providing interested parties with a means by which they may bring to the Commission's attention bona fide questions concerning grants made without hearing. The Commission proposed a bill to amend section 309

(c) in the 83d Congress. It was introduced in that Congress as H. R. 7795, but no action on the bill was taken.

Section 309 (c) now provides that all authorizations granted without a hearing shall remain subject to protest by any "party in interest" for a 30-day period. The protest must show that the protestant is a party in interest and must specify with particularity the facts relied on to sustain the protest. Within 30 days from the date of filing of a protest, the Commission must determine whether the protest meets these requirements. If the Commission so finds, it is directed to set the application involved for hearing on the issues specified in the protest as well as such additional issues as the Commission may prescribe. The protestant has the burden of proof and the burden of proceeding with the evidence on issues set forth in his protest and not specifically adopted by the Commission. The Commission is directed to expedite protest hearing cases, and the effective date of the Commission's action protested is to be postponed until the Commission's decision after hearing, unless the particular authorization is necessary to the maintenance or conduct of an existing service.

The protest rule has resulted in substantial delays in the construction and operation of new television or radio stations authorized by the Commission without hearing. For any "party in interest" may file a protest and the term "party in interest" has been held by the courts to include existing stations in the same service as the grantee who might be adversely affected economically by the grant. In addition, relevant court decisions appear to indicate that stations in other services or other persons who might suffer economic injury as a result of competition afforded by the new stations would be parties in interest entitled to protest. Furthermore, if the protestant shows himself to be a party in interest and details his objections to the grant, one interpretation of the present statute is that the Commission is required to designate the application for hearing on the issues specified in the protest and cannot dispose of the protest, as on demurrer, on the pleadings. The Commission has taken the position that where it finds that the matters raised by the protest would not require the grant to be set aside, even if the factual allegations are assumed to be proven, the protest may be disposed of on the pleadings or, where substantial legal questions are involved, after oral argument on the legal issues, without designating the application for a full evidentiary hearing. However, it is recognized that the present language of section 309 (c) leaves in doubt the Commission's authority to dispose of a protest on the basis of the pleadings or after oral argument. It is believed that the statute would be amended so as to make clear that the Commission has authority to demur to the pleadings, in order to insure that it would not be necessary to hold evidentiary hearings which could serve no useful purpose and which would therefore be contrary to the public interest by delaying the initiation of a new or improved radio service. Such hearings, it should be indicated, not only delay the effectiveness of the particular authorization involved but also occupy the time and efforts of members of the Commission's limited staff who could otherwise be utilized in connection with other proceedings, including necessary hearings involving competitive television applications.

There is also some question under the present language of section 309 (c) as to whether the Commission must, in designating a protest for hearing, include the precise issues which the protestant has set forth regardless of the manner in which such issues have been drafted by the protestant. The Commission has held that where the

protestant's issues are drawn too broadly or include matters not covered by the facts relied on, it has the authority to redraft the issues to reflect accurately the substantive matters raised in the protest. Here again, however, the Commission's authority is not entirely free from doubt, and a clarifying amendment to the statute is considered appropriate.

As indicated above, the final provision of section 309 (c) makes it mandatory for the Commission, once a protest has been granted, to postpone the effective date of the Commission's action to which protest is made until the effective date of the Commission's decision after the hearing on the protest. The only exception to this mandatory stay provision is when the authorization protested is necessary to the maintenance or conduct of an existing service, in which event the Commission may authorize the use of the facilities in question pending the Commission's decision after hearing. This has required staying the effectiveness of all authorizations for new facilities when protests have been granted, despite the fact that in some instances the public interest clearly required that the authorization remain in effect and the new series be inaugurated pending the outcome of the protest hearing. It is believed that an amendment is necessary which would give the Commission discretion to deny a stay in those cases where it can find on the record that the public interest clearly requires such action.

In order to obviate these difficulties the enclosed proposal would amend section 309 (c) to make clear that while any party in interest could protest a grant of a permit made without hearing, such protest would not automatically result in staying the effectiveness of the grant or require a hearing regardless of the merits of the claims advanced by the protestant. Instead, the proposed new language would provide that within 30 days of the filing of such a protest the Commission, upon consideration of the protest, and any reply thereto, would issue a decision as to the legal sufficiency of the protest as to standing and the particularity of the matters alleged as grounds for setting aside the grant. In the event the Commission finds in the affirmative as to these matters, it would be required to designate the application for hearing upon issues relating to all matters raised in the protest, except that the Commission could exclude such matters as to which it finds that, even if the facts alleged by the protestant were proven, they would not constitute grounds for setting aside the grant. The amendment further provides that if a protest is designated for hearing, the effective date of the grant shall be postponed, unless the authorization is necessary for the continuation of an existing service, or unless the Commission affirmatively finds, for specified reasons, that the public interest requires the grant to remain in effect. It is believed that the revised language would achieve the apparent objective of the protest rule in affording interested parties an opportunity to bring to the attention of the Commission questions about grants made without hearing and to obtain a determination thereon. At the same time, it would avoid the utilization of the protest rule as a device for delay on the part of competitors.

The Commission, therefore, recommends that section 309 (c) should be amended as set forth in the attached proposed bill. The submission of this proposal to the Congress has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. If there is any further information concerning this matter which the Commission can furnish, please do not hesitate to let us know. There are also attached the separate views of Commissioner Doerfer concerning this matter.

GEORGE C. MCCONNAUGHEY,  
Chairman.

## SEPARATE VIEWS OF COMMISSIONER JOHN C. DOERFER

Commissioner Doerfer believes that section 309 (c) of the Communications Act should be repealed in its entirety. It is inconsistent with the philosophy of the act which seeks to provide for the public interest within the framework of competition.

"Plainly it is not the purpose of the act to protect a licensee against competition, but to protect the public. Congress intended to leave competition in the business of broadcasting where it found it, to permit a licensee who was not interfering electrically with other broadcasters to survive or succumb according to his ability to make his programs attractive to the public." (The *Sanders* case (309 U. S. 470 (1940)).)

Experience has shown that section 309 (c) demands an undue amount of Commission time, is used primarily for delay by competitors, and accomplishes no useful purpose. In effect, it creates two attorneys general to protect the public interest, the FCC, and private parties. Governmental agencies are established upon the theory that they are competent and conscientious to protect the public interest. There is no more need for two attorneys general in such matters than for two district attorneys in a criminal case.

If the Commission, through inadvertence, illegality, or impropriety, makes a grant, all that is necessary to protect the public interest is to call the Commission's attention to the facts and to submit evidence or indicate a source of probative evidence to protect the public interest. Misfeasance, if any, on the part of the Commission should be dealt with directly, not by the creation of an official kibitzer. The idea that the public should be denied a service pending selfish and self-serving maneuvers by competitors is wholly foreign to the American concept of administrative agencies. These were created primarily to expedite matters. Section 309 (c) is an obstruction to the prompt expedition of many matters before the Federal Communications Commission. To illustrate: Recently out of 1,400 minutes of deliberation by 7 members of the Commission 397 minutes were spent considering protest matters, or a total of 28 percent of full Commission time. This constitutes a demand for an undue proportion of time on matters which eventually prove to contribute little, if anything, to the protection of the public interest.

## AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases.

This proposed legislation is introduced at the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from Chairman Rizley transmitting a statement of the purpose and need for the legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1649) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,  
Washington, March 21, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of Senate,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the attached draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases."

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ROSS RIZLEY,  
Chairman.

## STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED, SO AS TO AUTHORIZE THE IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES IN CERTAIN CASES

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to provide a statutory tool for the more effective enforcement of the provisions of title IV of the Civil Aeronautics Act and of the Board's economic orders and regulations issued thereunder and under section 1002 (1) of the act. At the present time violations of these provisions are subject to criminal prosecution under section 902 (a) of the act. This sanction is an effective deterrent in serious cases involving knowing and willful violations. With respect to many cases of minor infractions, violations of a less serious nature, and actions falling short of knowing and willful misconduct, the conventional criminal proceedings are either too drastic, too cumbersome, or altogether inappropriate. It is in acting upon these less serious but more numerous violations that the Board believes it could avail itself of the remedy of civil penalties in a constructive manner toward improving the enforcement program. The following will serve to illustrate some of the results which could be expected:

1. The right to compromise civil penalties would afford a flexible remedy enabling the Board to adapt the severity of the sanction to the offense.

2. Light civil penalties could be used effectively to discourage violations which individually are so minor as not to justify the time and effort involved in a formal proceeding or court action, but which in their cumulative effect hamper the exercise of the Board's regulatory functions. In the majority of cases, the defendant can be expected to pay the civil penalty or agree to an acceptable compromise of it, and the device would effectively serve its purpose. In the relatively few instances in which a refusal to compromise can be expected, court action would, of course, still be necessary.

3. The availability of the remedy of civil penalties would enable the Board to attack violations speedily and avoid situations such as have existed in the past where offenders have been able to persist in violations during the time required to prosecute a formal proceeding or court action. Of course, the same limitation on their effectiveness noted under item No. 2, above, with respect to cases in which there is a refusal to compromise would also apply here.

4. The availability of the remedy of civil penalties would afford an adequate remedy as a substitute for criminal action except in serious cases where willful and knowing violations involving the necessary degree of criminal responsibility may be established. Moreover, the imposition of civil penalties would, in many cases, have a salutary effect comparable to that of criminal penalties without subjecting the offender to the seri-

ous stigma which follows imposition of criminal penalties.

The modifications proposed in existing sections 901 (a) and 902 (a) of the act have been drafted primarily for the purpose of making available this additional sanction. The changes to section 901 (a), in addition, incorporate amendments effected by Reorganization Plans III and IV of 1940, and Reorganization Plan V of 1950. In regard to section 902 (a), only such changes have been made to retain the status quo with respect to criminal penalties as are made necessary in view of the amendment of section 901 (a).

The proposed legislation further authorizes the Board to compromise any civil penalties so imposed for violations of title IV or the regulations issued thereunder.

There would seem to be no doubt that the existence of the power in the Board to seek civil penalties and to compromise in the economic field much as is now done by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics in the safety field would be a substantial aid to the Board's economic enforcement activities.

## ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. President, when the bill dealing with the increase in judges' salaries and the salaries of Members of Congress was before the Committee on the Judiciary, there was some suggestion that there should be included an adjustment of the salaries of referees in bankruptcy. It was my feeling then, however, in the first place, that only the subject matters which were in the Segal Commission report should be considered in connection with the bill; and, secondly, that the Judicial Conference which has peculiar jurisdiction over salaries and other matters relating to referees in bankruptcy, should have an opportunity to consider that subject before any legislation was introduced.

The Judicial Conference has met, and has made some recommendations to the adjustment of salaries of referees in bankruptcy, and a bill has been introduced by the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York. In order to bring this subject before the Judiciary Committee and the Senate, I am introducing a similar bill, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1652) to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 13 ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"

Mr. CLEMENTS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 300,000 copies of Senate Document No. 13, 84th Congress entitled "Our Capitol," of which 100,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 200,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

### TRANSFER OF UNITED NATIONS NARCOTICS DIVISION FROM NEW YORK CITY TO GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, a great many people who are concerned about the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs are very much disturbed by the proposal of the Secretary General of the United Nations that the Narcotics Division of the United Nations be transferred from New York City to Geneva, Switzerland. The United States is the world's chief victim of illegal international traffic in narcotic drugs. The pressure of world public opinion is one of the major weapons which the United Nations has in its attempts to stamp out narcotic traffic. So long as the U. N. Narcotics Division remains in New York it is in the spotlight, with full publicity on all its work. If the U. N. Narcotics Division is moved to Geneva, away from other major U. N. activities, its effectiveness will be greatly reduced. Because of the seriousness of this matter, it is believed that the United States Senate should go on public record in strong opposition to the proposed transfer.

On behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and myself, I submit a resolution to express the opposition of the Senate to the proposed transfer of the United Nations Narcotics Division from New York City to Geneva, Switzerland, and request that the resolution be appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 87), submitted by Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. KUCHEL) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Secretary General of the United Nations has indicated his intention to transfer the Narcotic Division of the United Nations from New York City to Geneva; and

Whereas many international narcotic treaties are being ably administered by the United Nations in New York City in a stupendous effort to halt the diabolical narcotic smuggling activities; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to retain the Narcotic Division at the New York City headquarters of the United Nations to maintain the full force of publicity and public opinion on this vile traffic: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the United States Senate strongly opposes the transfer of the Narcotics Division of the United Nations from New York City to Geneva, Switzerland. Copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the Secretary of State for transmission to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

### PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON THE MISSOURI RIVER (S. DOC. NO. 31)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated July 27, 1954, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations,

on a review of a report on the Missouri River, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

Address entitled "Germany's Role in World Affairs," delivered at Omaha, Nebr., on March 27, 1955, by the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Commencement address delivered by Spyros P. Skouras at the New York Medical College on June 2, 1954.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Extract from letter written by the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Representative from the 18th District of Pennsylvania.

Editorial entitled "Visualizing the National Debt," published in a recent edition of the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Proclamation by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Governor of Michigan, designating Saturday, April 2, 1955, as Hans Christian Andersen Day.

Editorial entitled "Closed-Eyes Policy" published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 31, 1955, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial on surgical triumphs of the University of Minnesota, published in the Minneapolis Star of March 28, 1955.

Editorial entitled "Ike Frowns on War Talk," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of March 30, 1955.

Editorial on Senator NEELY's attack on the President, published in the Washington Post of March 31, 1955.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Article entitled "Industry Moves South, and With It, Prosperity," written by Joseph A. Fox, and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 31, 1955.

By Mr. BEALL:

Editorial entitled "Thomas Parran," published in the Baltimore Sun of April 1, 1955.

By Mr. PAYNE:

Article on John F. Stevens and the Panama Canal.

By Mr. IVES:

A short summary of the accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

By Mr. WILEY:

Letter from Mr. Goodhue Livingston, Jr., on the principles of Collective Security.

### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SO-CALLED BRICKER AMENDMENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I understand that unanimous consent was given for the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary to sit this afternoon while the Senate is in session. I wish to give notice that immediately following the Easter recess the same committee will start hearings on the so-called Bricker

amendment. The subcommittee hopes to complete the hearings in a reasonably short time thereafter.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee for that statement. He assured me yesterday that that would be done.

### THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, 6 years ago next Monday, April 4, in our Capital City of Washington, 12 nations signed the North Atlantic Treaty, thus initiating one of the most successful experiments in collective defense and international cooperation ever undertaken by man.

Since that day in 1949, Greece and Turkey have acceded to the North Atlantic Treaty. And today it is especially fitting that the Senate of the United States should be about to consider the entrance of the Federal Republic of West Germany into the NATO family.

This sixth anniversary also marks a great milestone in the development of peaceful and cooperative relations between those two historic rivals of Europe, Germany and France. Thus the causes for celebration are especially great this year.

The dangers from the Communist East remain great. But with the progress over the last 6 years in building a strong and peaceful Atlantic and European community, we can truthfully say that at no time since the end of World War II has there been such confidence in our ability to meet those dangers.

And so as we commemorate the birth of NATO, I think it is altogether fitting that we rededicate ourselves to the principles set forth on April 4, 6 years ago, principles for which we will, if necessary, fight.

The great hope for all free men is that as a result of working together in the cause of peace and liberty, we may not have to take up arms and resort to war again.

We remain today firm believers in those words written 6 years ago when 12 great nations reaffirmed "their faith in the purposes and principles of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments," and when these same nations agreed "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law."

### IMMIGRATION AND WORLD FOOD PROBLEMS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, quite naturally many Christian people in this country are disturbed by the fact that we have unmanageable surpluses of food while some 800 million or more people in the world go to bed hungry every night.

The two solutions for this problem most frequently proposed are for us to let more people come to this country to share our resources, or to share our surplus food with them by giving it away or selling it abroad at reduced rates.